REMARKS

The present application was filed on December 4, 2000 with claims 1-20. Claims 1, 11 and 14 have been amended. Claims 1-6, 9-12 and 14-18 remain pending, and claims 1, 11 and 14 are the pending independent claims.

In the outstanding Office Action dated June 1, 2006, the Examiner: (i) rejected claims 1-6, 9-12 and 14-18 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph; (ii) rejected claims 1, 2, 6, 9-12, 14 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,473,778 to Gibbon (hereinafter "Gibbon"); and (iii) rejected claims 3-5 and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gibbon in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,654,030 to Hui (hereinafter "Hui").

With regard to the rejection of claims 1-6, 9-12 and 14-18 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, claims 1, 11 and 14 have been amended to correct the indefiniteness as set forth by the Examiner. Accordingly, withdrawal of the §112 rejection of claims 1-6, 9-12 and 14-18 is therefore respectfully requested.

With regard to the rejection of claims 1, 2, 6, 9-12, 14 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gibbon, Applicants respectfully assert that Gibbon fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as specified in M.P.E.P. §2143, in that Gibbon fails to teach or suggest all the claim limitations of the amended independent claims. For at least this reason, a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established.

Amended independent claim 1 recites a method of multi-stage creation of multimedia content. Multimedia assets are incorporated into a framework as a series of related frames comprising a header frame, a thumbnail frame, a meta frame, one or more media frames and an end of sequence frame. A multimedia description file is created in a template for formatting multimedia assets. The multimedia assets and the multimedia description file are combined in the template through a batch-processing program to create a multimedia repository file executable on a multimedia player. The multimedia repository file is stored as a single file on a shared storage device. The multimedia repository file is accessed by at least one authoring session manager for access to the multimedia assets, for creation of a modified multimedia description file in a template, and for creation of a modified multimedia repository file upon

combination of the multimedia assets and the modified multimedia description file. For each authoring session manager, the modified multimedia repository file is stored as a single file on a storage device associated with the authoring session manager, wherein the modified multimedia repository file is configured for execution on a multimedia player. Independent claims 11 and 14 recite similar limitations.

The examiner contends that Gibbon discloses the incorporation of multimedia assets into a framework as a series of related frames. The Examiner further contends that the slide show icon in the slide show document is equivalent to a thumbnail frame, the video frames are media frames, and the frame-reference transcript is equivalent to the meta frame. Further, the Examiner contends that a hypermedia document should have a title which is disclosed in the first frame of the slide show and should have an ending which is disclosed in the last frame of the sequence. However, the existence of slide show icons and a transcript in Gibbon fails to render obvious the incorporation of a thumbnail frame and a meta frame into a framework with one or more media frames. Such a slide show and transcript may result from other techniques that do not include incorporation of such frames into a framework. Further, a statement that a slide show "should" have a title and an ending, as provided by the Examiner, does not render obvious the incorporation of a header frame and an end of sequence frame into a framework with one or more media frames, a thumbnail frame and a meta frame.

In response to previous arguments set forth by Applicants, the Examiner contends that a header frame and end frame are evident from the transcripts. The Examiner cites specifically to column 5, lines 40-52 of Gibbon, where Gibbon describes transcripts as occasionally including phrases in the transcripts such as "begin video clip" and "voice over." It is not clear how the mere existence of such phrases in a transcript renders obvious the incorporation of a header frame and an end of sequence frame in a framework of multimedia assets. Thus, Gibbon fails to teach of suggest every element of the independent claims.

The Examiner further contends that Gibbon discloses the combining of multimedia assets and a multimedia description file to create a multimedia repository file executable on a multimedia player. However, Gibbon only discloses the application of a template set to multimedia descriptors resulting in an HTML representation. An HTML representation differs

significantly from a multimedia repository file executable on a multimedia player. The Examiner further contends that it would have been obvious to modify Gibbon to include a batch-processing program. However, the Examiner only restates the independent claim language of the present invention in providing support for this obviousness contention, and thus, the Office Action fails to support why it would be obvious to modify Gibbon to include a batch-processing program in light of a template set that creates an HTML representation. Thus, Gibbon fails to suggest or disclose the combining of multimedia assets and a multimedia description file through a batch-processing program to create of a multimedia repository file that is executable on a multimedia player, as recited in the independent claims of the present invention.

As admitted by the Examiner, Gibbon fails to disclose the accessing of the single multimedia repository file for creation of a modified multimedia description file in a template, and the accessing of the single multimedia repository file for the creation of a modified multimedia repository file upon combination of the multimedia assets and the modified multimedia description file.

The Examiner further admits that Gibbon fails to disclose the storing of the modified multimedia description file and the modified multimedia repository file as a single modified multimedia repository file on a storage device associated with an authoring session manager. The Examiner fails to point to a portion of Gibbon that discloses anything remotely close to this element of the independent claims. For example, Gibbon fails to suggest or disclose anything regarding the accessing of a multimedia repository file from a shared storage device and the storage of a modified multimedia repository file on a device associated with an authoring session manager.

Dependent claims 2, 6, 9, 10, 12 and 18 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency from amended independent claims 1, 11 and 14, and also recite patentable subject matter in their own right. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection to claims 1, 2, 6, 9-12, 14 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

With regard to the rejection of claims 3-5 and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gibbon in view of Hui, Applicants respectfully assert that the cited combination fails to meet or render obvious the claim limitations. Hui describes a time marker

based on extensible mark-up language for synchronized multimedia presentation, but fails to remedy the deficiencies of Gibbon described above. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection to claims 3-5 and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

In view of the above, Applicants believe that claims 1-6, 9-12 and 14-18 are in condition for allowance, and respectfully requested withdrawal of the §112 and §103(a) rejections.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 1, 2006

Robert W. Griffith

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Reg. No. 48,956

Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP

90 Forest Avenue

Locust Valley, NY 11560

(516) 759-4547